

To: Ms. Wendy Dixon, EIS Property Manager, MS010
U.S. Dept. Of Energy
P.O.Box 30307
North Las Vegas, NV 89036 0307
Via Fax: 1 (800) 967-0739

Feb. 9, 2000

EIS001454

RECEIVED

From: Mrs. Delores White
925 Torington Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89108

FEB 14 2000

IDENTIFIER: "YUCCA MOUNTAIN DRAFT EIS"**TO MS DIXON AND THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:**

1 I'm very sorry DOE, but your Draft Environmental Impact Statement is unsatisfactory, unacceptable, and unsuitable for public view. It is extremely difficult for us regular citizens to understand. You have made it too complicated. Who has time to read this HUGE volume? You want public comments and you make it nearly impossible for us to do so.

You must make the facts more accesible to all Americans. Why don't you condense it and send us all a copy of the EIS in the mail just like the government does with our tax booklets? It would make more people aware. You'd certainly hear plenty of comments then. You say that would be cost prohibitive, but you are wasting billions of dollars anyway! We need the facts!

2 The public meetings were not properly publicized. You are taking advantage of the American people's busy schedules. I demand that you have more meetings, more open discussions, debates, etc., before you try to make this law. I couldn't believe that the last meeting on February 3, 2000 was not publicized. I thought it was an extention of the overloaded public hearing of January 11, 2000. It turned out to be a meeting to inform us on the change of guidelines. We were not allowed to openly ask you questions and get answers that evening. We instead, were told we would be getting answers to our questions by mail. Ridiculous! You are trying to pull the wool over our eyes!

3 Using Yucca Mountain as the sole repository is not the answer. The Constitution states that we are all created equal. We should all be sharing this burden, a burden put on us by the DOE's mismanagement of nuclear waste. It should be dealt with site by site, state by state. Transporting this waste through 43 states is insane!! You at the DOE know there are going to be catastrophic consequences if you do this. Why not put the billions of dollars you're throwing into Yucca Mountain on something less lethal. Go back and start again. Look into transmutation of this deadly substance. The Roy Process was mentioned at the January 11, 2000 hearing. Why have you discarded this approach when it's a viable process? As fast as we are advancing in technology we should be able to come up with a more sensible approach that won't be endangering the lives of so many Americans, something that won't affect our own safety and future generations to come.

5 Now, you are promising us that this is going to be safe. How about your 600,000 devoted workers at your nuclear weapons facilities. Were you honest with them and the dangerous environment they were working in? They weren't told the truth, just as you are not being honest with us. Now you are planning to use us as guinea pigs because of your mistakes in handling nuclear waste, and you're jeopardizing the lives of the entire nation. This is horrid politics and is totally unacceptable!

"Forgive them Father," for they know just what they do.

①